



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,167	12/31/2003	Dong-Shin Jung	Q77527	6951

23373 7590 04/12/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,167	JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Alvesteffer	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2005 and 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20050209, 20060126.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-27 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 15, 20, and 25 are independent claims. The Information Disclosure Statements filed February 9, 2005 and January 26, 2006 have been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Astiz et al. (hereinafter Astiz), United States Patent number 5,918,012.

Regarding claim 1, Astiz teaches an apparatus for providing object-in-content information, managed by an object-in-content information managing device (HTTP server) (see column 6 lines 1-5), comprising a central control unit (data processor) (see column 5 lines 55-58) operable to supply basic content information ((x,y,t) data) (see column 6 lines 64-67) and provide the object-in-content information in a user-viewable format (a URL loaded by a browser or viewer) (see column 6 lines 45-49); and an object information interface unit operable to transmit a request message including the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) to the object-in-content information managing device (HTTP server), receive a response message including the object-in-content information corresponding to the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) from the object-in-content

Art Unit: 2173

information managing device (HTTP server), and transmit the object-in-content information included in the response message to the central control unit (data processor) (see column 6 lines 46-56).

Regarding claim 2, Astiz teaches an apparatus for providing object-in-content information of content, comprising a basic content information converting unit (CGI script) operable to receive a message including basic content information ((x,y,t) data) of the content and provide converted basic content information (URL) corresponding to the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) (see column 7 lines 64-67); a storage unit operable to store the object-in-content information (HTTP server); an information search unit operable to extract the object-in-content information stored in the storage unit (web page) by using the converted basic content information (URL); and an object information transmitting unit operable to generate a response message including the object-in-content information provided by the information search unit and transmit the response message (HTTP server) (see column 8 lines 6-19).

Regarding claim 3, Astiz teaches that the basic content information converting unit (CGI script) receives the message, transmits the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) to a unit that provides the content (HTTP server), receives the converted basic content information (URL) from the unit and provides the converted basic content information (URL) (see column 7 lines 64-67).

Regarding claims 4-6, Astiz teaches that the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) comprises one of actual coordinates, a click time, a relative time, a content identifier, a channel number, or a combination thereof (column 7 lines 19-23).

Claims 7 and 8 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are rejected under the same grounds.

Claims 9 and 10 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are rejected under the same grounds.

Regarding claim 11, Astiz teaches a content provider operable to provide the content, receive the basic content information through a separate medium other than a medium providing the content, and provide the converted basic content information corresponding to the received basic content information through the separate medium (see Abstract last sentence). In Astiz, the script that converts the basic content information is stored separately from the location of the content itself.

Claim 12 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 13, Astiz teaches providing the object-in-content information included in the response message in a user-viewable format (see column 6 lines 46-56). In Astiz, the object-in-content information is in the form of a user-viewable web page shown in a browser.

Claim 14 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15 recites a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 16 and 17 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claims 16 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 18, Astiz teaches an object-in-content information provider operable to provide the object-in-content information without changing the content for the processing unit (see column 8 lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 19, Astiz teaches that the object-in-content information providing unit receives updated object-in-content information for the content. Because the object-in-content information of Astiz is loaded from the Internet, the most up-to-date content always loaded (see column 4 lines 54-59).

Claims 20 and 24 recite an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 20 and 24 are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 21 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claim 19. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 23 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 26 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 27 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 19. Therefore, claim 27 is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:30AM-7:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2173

SA
4-4-2007



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2174